

All this becomes unnecessary when the Code is followed. The only changes then would be *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 substituted by *Trochulus* Alten, 1812, and the family-group name TRICHIINAE Lozek, 1956 substituted by TROCHULINAE Lindholm, 1927.

The question is, is all the trouble to conserve *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 justified? So far as I know the genus is not of any importance in medicine or applied science and is best known only to taxonomists and amateur malacologists. The fact that *Trichia* Hartmann was recognized the type of a family group as late as 1956 also does not speak for a great importance of the genus. Furthermore, there is no long-standing uniformity in the use of *Trichia* for the molluscs. The name *Fruticicola* Held, 1837 was for a long time used for the type species of *Trichia* and I have always known the taxon as *Fruticicola hispida* (Linnaeus, 1758), a name used certainly beyond the middle of the 20th century (cf. para. 4 of the application). The name *Trichia* Hartmann has always been rather controversial because of the simultaneous use of *Trichia* De Haan, 1839 in Crustacea. Furthermore, *Trochulus* is not an entirely unknown name and has been used during the 20th century. The family-group name based on it (TROCHULINAE Lindholm, 1927) long before that based on *Trichia* Hartmann demonstrates this.

Concluding, I wish to remark that the discovery of *Trichia* Hoffman, 1790 as the oldest homonym, invalidating both *Trichia* De Haan, 1839 and *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840, is more or less a blessing, wiping away the controversy over priority between the crustacean and molluscan names. It means that there is no longer ambiguity over whether the crustacean or the molluscan name *Trichia* is meant, and no numerous and complicated manoeuvres by the Commission are needed to save the least deserving of the three names. In Crustacea the disappearance of the name *Trichia* has been accepted by all the workers that I contacted, and the replacement by *Zalasia* Rathbun, 1897 will not cause much confusion, especially when accepted immediately. I would expect that in Mollusca the disappearance of *Trichia* Hartmann will not do much harm, especially as the name of the genus has changed several times in its history, and a period of stability can be expected with the introduction of *Trochulus*. The latter name has not been used for other genera and there is no question of switching it from one genus to another. The only argument for starting the complicated machinery of the Commission for saving *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 is its frequent usage in the last ten years, but in Myxomycetes (or Mycetozoa) *Trichia* has clearly been used unambiguously for a much longer period of time. My plea is that in this case the Code should be strictly applied, this being the most simple and least time consuming procedure.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of *Polydora websteri* Hartmann in Loosanoff & Engle, 1943 (Annelida, Polychaeta) by a ruling that it is not to be treated as a replacement name for *P. caeca* Webster, 1879, and designation of a lectotype for *P. websteri***

(Case 3080; see BZN 55: 212–216; 57: 43–45)

Vasily I. Radashevsky

*Institute of Marine Biology, Vladivostok 690041, Russia*

Jason D. Williams

*Department of Biological Sciences, University of Rhode Island, 100 Flagg Road, Kingston, RI 02881-0816, U.S.A.*